

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Alexandria Division

AMAZON.COM and AMAZON DATA)
SERVICES, INC.,)
Plaintiffs,)
v.) Civil Action No. 1:20-cv-484 RDA/IDD
WDC HOLDINGS LLC dba NORTHSTAR)
COMMERCIAL PARTNERS, et al.)
Defendants.)

800 HOYT LLC,)
Intervening Interpleader Plaintiff/)
Intervening Interpleader Counter-Defendant,)
v.)
BRIAN WATSON; WDC HOLDINGS)
LLC; BW HOLDINGS, LLC,)
Interpleader Defendants,)
and)
AMAZON.COM, et al.)
Interpleader Defendants/Interpleader)
Counter-Plaintiffs.)

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Defendant Carleton Nelson's Motion to File
Documents Under Seal ("Motion") [Dkt. No. 1116]. This matter can be resolved without oral
argument, as such argument would not aid the decisional process. Upon consideration of the
Motion and for good cause shown, it is hereby

ORDERED that the Motion is **GRANTED in part and DENIED in part**. The Motion is granted as to sealing dollar any figures, developer names/contact information, business transaction names, and developer certifications in Defendant Carleton Nelson's Brief in Support of his Motion to Compel [Dkt. No. 1117]. The Motion is also granted as to sealing Exhibit C, Exhibit H, Exhibit I, and Exhibit N. The motion is denied as to sealing Exhibit A and Exhibit B. It is further

ORDERED that the parties fully comply with Local Rule 5. After reviewing the pending motions to seal, the Court concludes that these motions have been filed, in large part, pursuant to the parties' Protective Order. In that regard, Local Rule 5(C) also provides that, "agreement of the parties that a document or other material should be filed under seal or the designation of a document or other material as confidential during discovery is not, by itself, sufficient justification for allowing a document or other material to be filed under seal." In addition, pursuant to Local Civil Rule 5(C), "when a party moves to file material under seal because another party has designated that material as confidential, the party designating the material as confidential must file a response to the motion." Upon review of the docket, the majority of the pending motions to seal are unaccompanied by a response from the party who designated the material confidential. Pursuant to Local Rule 5(C), the response from the designating party must specifically describe how the standard for sealing has been satisfied. Boilerplate statements like "the filings contain or refer to material that is not publicly available and contains or reflects sensitive confidential, business, financial, or proprietary information" are insufficient.

Furthermore, the parties are reminded that motions to file documents under seal are generally disfavored and discouraged, and any request to file a document or material under seal

must be supported by good faith efforts to seal or redact as much as necessary to protect legitimate interests. It is further

ORDERED that the parties review the current pending motions to seal, and revise their sealing requests consistent with this Order. It is further

ORDERED that any and all revisions and/or responses to the current pending motions to seal shall be filed by no later than close of business on Wednesday, February 15, 2023.

ENTERED this 8th day of February 2023.

/s/ Ivan D. Davis

Ivan D. Davis
United States Magistrate Judge

Alexandria, Virginia